

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- BLACK BORDERS**
- IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

(2) (3)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/769,924	01/25/2001	Andrea Bimson	40655.0300	5337
7590	09/03/2004		EXAMINER	
SNELL & WILMER LLP 400 EAST VAN BUREN ONE ARIZONA CENTER PHOENIX, AZ 85004-2202			JACOBS, LASHONDA T	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2157	

DATE MAILED: 09/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/769,924	BIMSON ET AL.
	Examiner LaShonda T Jacobs	Art Unit 2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 June 2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This is a Final Office Action Rejection in response to Applicants' Amendment and Request for Reconsideration filed on June 22, 2004. Claims 1-15 are presented for further examination. Newly added claims 16-23 are also presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dabney et al (hereinafter, "Dabney", 6,643,663) in view of Plantz et al (hereinafter, "Plantz", 6,088,702) and in further view of Bernado et al (hereinafter, "Bernado", 6,308,188).

As per claims 1 and 12, Dabney discloses a system and method for implementing changes to content on an Internet website server, comprising

- an intranet server coupled to provide input to said internet server (col. 5, lines 24-42, col. 6, lines 22-47 and lines 60-64);
- a workflow application coupled to said intranet server (col. 5, lines 24-49);

Art Unit: 2157

- an author (web editor) interfacing with said workflow application to develop and provide page content in said workflow application (col. 5, lines 24-42 and col. 6, lines 21-47); and
- at least one reviewer (manager) interfacing with said workflow application for receiving and reviewing said page content (col. 5, lines 24-42 and col. 6, lines 21-47).

However, Dabney does not explicitly disclose:

- an administrator interfacing with said workflow application for receiving page content reviewed and approved by said at least one reviewer and launching said content to said intranet server for input to said internet server.

Plantz discloses a Group Publishing System including:

- an administrator interfacing with said workflow application for receiving page content reviewed and approved by said at least one reviewer and launching said content to said intranet server for input to said internet server (col. 10, lines 63-67 and col. 11, lines 1-42).

Given the teaching of Plantz, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Dabney by incorporating or implementing an administrator to review and edit documents in a database and uploading the documents to the web in timely and efficient manner.

While the combined system of Dabney and Plantz, discloses the invention substantially as claims discussed above, it does not explicitly disclose editing webpage content, wherein said webpage content is in accordance with template rules defined by table structure. Nonetheless,

editing webpage content, wherein said webpage content is in accordance with template rules defined by table structure is well known in the art as evidenced by Bernado.

In similar art, Bernado discloses editing webpage content, wherein said webpage content is in accordance with template rules defined by table structure (col. 2, lines 45-54, col. 3, lines 2-31, col. 5, lines 51-67, col. 6, lines 1-8, col. 8, lines 32-41, lines 6667, col. 9, lines 1-7 and lines 39-58).

Given the teaching of Bernado, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined system of Dabney and Plantz, by employing the well-known conventional feature of editing webpage content, wherein said webpage content is in accordance with template rules defined by table structure allowing the designer/user to review/edit documents/website content without requiring the designer/user to write or edit HTML code.

As per claims 2 and 13, Dabney further discloses:

- at least a second reviewer (manager) interfacing with said workflow application (col. 5, lines 24-42).

As per claim 3, Dabney discloses:

- wherein said at least one reviewer is an editor (col. 5, lines 24-42).

As per claim 4, Dabney discloses:

- wherein said at least a second reviewer is a legal reviewer (col. 5, lines 24-42 and col. 6, lines 21-25).

As per claim 5, Dabney discloses:

- wherein said at least a second reviewer is a business owner (manager) (col. 5, lines 24-42).

Art Unit: 2157

As per claims **6** and **14**, Dabney discloses:

- wherein said at least one reviewer rejects said page (webpage) content and returns said rejected page (webpage) content to said workflow application for revision by said author, said author revising said page (webpage) content and returning said revised page (webpage) content to said workflow application for review (col. 5, lines 24-42).

As per claim **7**, Dabney discloses:

- wherein said at least a second reviewer rejects said page (webpage) content and returns said rejected page (webpage) content to said workflow application for revision (col. 5, lines 24-42).

As per claim **8**, Dabney discloses:

- wherein said rejected page (webpage) content returned to said workflow application is sent to said author for revision (col. 5, lines 24-42).

As per claim **9**, Dabney discloses:

- wherein said rejected page (webpage) content returned to said workflow application is sent to said at least one reviewer for revision (col. 5, lines 24-42).

As per claims **10**, **11** and **15**, Dabney discloses the invention substantially as claimed.

However, Dabney does not explicitly disclose:

- said administrator interfacing with said workflow application for receiving revised page (webpage) content reviewed and approved by said at least one reviewer and launching said content to said intranet server for input to said internet server.

Plantz discloses a Group Publishing System including:

- said administrator interfacing with said workflow application for receiving revised page (webpage) content reviewed and approved by said at least one reviewer and launching said content to said intranet server for input to said internet server (col. 10, lines 63-67 and col. 11, lines 1-42).

Given the teaching of Plantz, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Dabney by incorporating or implementing an administrator to review and edit documents in a database and uploading the documents to web in timely and efficient manner.

As per claims **16** and **18**, Dabney in view of Plantz discloses the invention substantially as claims discussed above.

However, Dabney in view of Plantz, does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the webpage content is XML.

Bernado discloses a system and method for building a web site with automated workflow including:

- wherein the webpage content is XML (col. 3, lines 15-16 and col. 8, lines 14-17).

Given the teaching of Bernado, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Dabney and Plantz by specifying the webpage content as XML since the same functionality is achieved.

As per claim **17**, Dabney in view of Plantz discloses the invention substantially as claims discussed above.

However, Dabney in view of Plantz does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein said webpage content is XML; and

- wherein said administrator is further configured to launch said webpage content by converting XML to HTML.

Bernado discloses a system and method for building a web site with automated workflow including:

- wherein said webpage content is XML (col. 3, lines 15-16 and col. 8, lines 14-17); and
- wherein said administrator is further configured to launch said webpage content by converting XML to HTML (col. 5, lines 14-26).

Given the teaching of Bernado, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Dabney and Plantz by specifying the webpage content as XML and launching the webpage since the same functionality is achieved.

As per claim 19, Dabney in view of Plantz discloses the invention substantially as claims discussed above.

However, Dabney in view of Plantz does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein said webpage content is XML; and
- wherein said launching step includes launching said webpage content by converting XML to HTML.

Bernado discloses a system and method for building a web site with automated workflow including:

- wherein said webpage content is XML (col. 3, lines 15-16 and col. 8, lines 14-17); and
- wherein said launching step includes launching said webpage content by converting XML to HTML (col. 5, lines 14-26).

Given the teaching of Bernado, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Dabney and Plantz by specifying the webpage content as XML and launching the webpage since the same functionality is achieved.

As per claims **20** and **22**, Dabney in view of Plantz discloses the invention substantially as claims discussed above.

However, Dabney in view of Plantz does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the administrator is further configured to at least one of identify, create , assign and modify workflow groups.

Bernado discloses a system and method for building a web site with automated workflow including:

- wherein the administrator is further configured to at least one of identify, create, assign and modify workflow groups (col. 9, lines 39-58, col. 10, lines 1-16 and lines 20-31).

Given the teaching of Bernado, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Dabney and Plantz by allowing the administrator to identify, create, assign and modify workflow groups since the same functionality is achieved.

As per claims **21** and **23**, Dabney in view of Plantz discloses the invention substantially as claims discussed above.

However, Dabney in view of Plantz does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the administrator is further configured to grant varying levels of access based on workflow groups.

Bernado discloses a system and method for building a web site with automated workflow including:

- wherein the administrator is further configured to grant varying levels of access based on workflow groups (col. 9, lines 39-58, col. 10, lines 1-16 and lines 20-31).

Given the teaching of Bernado, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Dabney and Plantz by allowing the administrator grant varying levels of access based on workflow groups since the same functionality is achieved.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The Office notes the following arguments:

(a) Dabney does not disclose an implementation of pre-defined webpage templates.

(b) Dabney does not disclose limiting access to a content management system or creating workflow access groups.

(c) Plantz does not disclose means of granting varying levels of access based on group and/or individual permissions as the presently claim invention.

In response to:

(a)-(c), Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,304,886 to Bernado et al

U.S. Pat. No. 6,484,149 to Jammes et al

U.S. Pat. No. 6,263,352 to Cohen

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LaShonda T. Jacobs whose telephone number is 703-305-7494. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 703-308-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LaShonda T. Jacobs
Examiner
Art Unit 2157

ltj
August 24, 2004



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Saleh". Below the signature, the name "SALEH NAJJAR" is printed in capital letters, followed by "PRIMARY EXAMINER" in a slightly smaller font.